

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: _____ D. _____

Date: _____ April 26, 2006 _____

Topic: First Review of Approval of Local School Division Remedial Plans

Presenter: Mrs. Kathleen M. Smith, Director of the Office of School Improvement

Telephone Number: (804) 786-5819 **E-Mail Address:** Kathleen.Smith@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

_____ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

_____ Board review required by

_____ State or federal law or regulation

X Board of Education regulation

_____ Other: _____

_____ Action requested at this meeting X Action requested at future meeting: Final Review May 24, 2006

Previous Review/Action:

X No previous board review/action

_____ Previous review/action

date _____

action _____

Background Information:

As required by 8 VAC 20-630-20, school divisions are required to develop a remediation plan designed to strengthen and improve the academic achievement of eligible students. Local school divisions have submitted remedial plans for summer 2006 to the department for approval by the Board of Education. Data regarding the summer program for 2005 will be submitted to the department by school divisions as required by the Code of Virginia in September 2006. This data cannot be collected until after administration of the Standards of Learning assessments in spring 2006.

Summary of Major Elements

Department staff members have reviewed remediation plans from 130 school divisions and determined that all of the plans meet the requirements of 8 VAC 20-630-20. Two divisions, Loudoun County and Frederick County, have indicated that they will not offer a remedial summer program. A summary of the quality indicators proposed in the remedial plans from the 130 school divisions that reported as required is attached.

8 VAC 20-630-50 requires school divisions to report to the department the pass rate on the Standards of Learning

assessments for students who attend the 2006 summer remedial programs or, in the case of year-round schools, 2006-2007 intersession programs. Divisions will submit SOL data pertaining to the 2006 summer remedial program, or in the case of year-round schools, 2006-2007 intersession programs in September 2007.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education accept for first review the report on local school division remedial plans.

Impact on Resources:

None

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

It is anticipated that this item will be presented for the Board of Education's final review and approval at the May 24, 2006, meeting.

Data Submitted on the 2006-2007 School Division Remediation Plans

A. Program Offering

Type of Program to be Offered in Summer 2006	Percentage of 130 Localities* K-8	Percentage of 130 Localities* Secondary
Remedial summer school*	98%	78%
Intersession program for year-round school	9%	3%
*Loudoun County and Frederick County will not offer a remedial summer program in 2006.		

B. Quality Indicators

Quality Indicator (Proposed)	Percentage of 130 of the Localities	Proposed Qualifier Indicated by School Division on the Remedial Plan
In-service and training is provided for staff not trained in remediation techniques that are assigned to the program. (In some localities, all staff are already trained.)	68%	1-4 hours of training are provided.
	8%	5-9 hours of training are provided.
	8%	10 or more hours of training are provided.
Data regarding student content weaknesses are used to design the remediation program (e.g., SOL assessments, diagnostic tests, classroom assessments).	78%	Content is developed for a program that will meet the needs of the greatest number of students who may require remediation.
	68%	Content is developed for the individual needs of each student.

Quality Indicator (Proposed)	Percentage of 130 of the Localities	Proposed Qualifier Indicated by School Division on the Remedial Plan
Communication between the remedial teacher and the classroom teacher regarding the students' needs and progress is maintained.	57%	Regular classroom teachers meet with remedial teachers to discuss individual student's needs.
	78%	A written record is completed by the regular classroom teacher regarding each student and is reviewed by the remediation teacher prior to the beginning of the remediation program.
	29%	The regular classroom teacher determines the expected remediation goal(s) for students.
	45%	The remediation teacher determines the expected remediation goal(s) for students.
	53%	The remediation teacher and the regular classroom teacher collaboratively determine the expected remediation goal(s) for students.

Quality Indicator (Proposed)	Percentage of 130 of the Localities	Proposed Qualifier Indicated by School Division on the Remedial Plan
Communication between the remedial teacher and the classroom teacher regarding the students' needs and progress is maintained. (Cont.)	30%	Regular classroom teachers meet with remedial teachers to discuss the individual student's progress in meeting expected remediation goal(s) for students.
	75%	A written record regarding the individual student's progress in meeting remediation goals is completed by the remediation teacher and is reviewed by the regular classroom teacher.
When students have exceptionally low performance, they have been screened for reading deficits before being remediated in a content area.	55%	Remediation will continue in the content area(s) with adjustments made by the remediation teacher for the reading level.
	68%	Remediation will continue in the content area(s) with adjustments made by the remediation teacher and the student is additionally given specific support for reading instruction.

Quality Indicator (Proposed)	Percentage of 130 of the Localities	Proposed Qualifier Indicated by School Division on the Remedial Plan
When students have exceptionally low performance, they have been screened for reading deficits before being remediated in a content area. (Cont.)	22%	Remediation will not continue in the content area(s). As an alternative, the student is given specific intensive support for reading instruction.
For remedial summer school, more than the 40 minimum hours of instruction are provided in a K-5 integrated program of two or more subjects.	41%	40-59 hours of instruction are provided.
	33%	60-79 hours of instruction are provided.
	12%	80-99 hours of instruction are provided.
	4%	100+ hours of instruction are provided.
For remedial summer school, K-12, more than the 20 minimum hours of instruction are provided for each core subject.	32%	20-39 hours of instruction are provided.
	28%	40-59 hours of instruction are provided.
	32%	60-79 hours of instruction are provided.
	8%	80-99 hours of instruction are provided.
	4%	100+ hours of instruction are provided.

Quality Indicator (Proposed)	Percentage of 130 of the Localities	Proposed Qualifier Indicated by School Division on the Remedial Plan
For remedial summer school, in K-5 programs, the required pupil-to-teacher ratio is less than 18:1.	2%	1 remediation teacher to no more than 5 students.
	18%	1 remediation teacher to no more than 10 students.
	37%	1 remediation teacher to no more than 12 students.
	42%	1 remediation teacher to no more than 18 students.
For remedial summer school, in 6-12 programs, the required pupil-to-teacher ratio is less than 18:1.	1%	1 remediation teacher to no more than 5 students.
	16%	1 remediation teacher to no more than 10 students.
	30%	1 remediation teacher to no more than 12 students.
	48%	1 remediation teacher to no more than 18 students.

Quality Indicator (Proposed)	Percentage of 130 of the Localities	Proposed Qualifier Indicated by School Division on the Remedial Plan
K-8 The regulation required the remediation goal for the student to include an expected target score on a locally-designed or selected test that measures the SOL content being remediated. Divisions reported the type of assessment used for this purpose as follows: S = SOL test, including retake of the SOL in 2006-2007 LS = Locally-selected (i.e., Algebra Readiness Diagnostic Test, PALS, or commercial test) LD = Locally-developed test (e.g., common tests developed by division staff) to measure student performance on SOL A = Alternate assessment as indicated on the IEP	0%	English/Writing S
	0%	LS
	65%	LD
	42%	A
	75%	Mathematics S
	75%	LS
	62%	LD
	42%	A
	48%	Social Studies S
	31%	LS
	42%	LD
	28%	A
	49%	Science S
	30%	LS
	42%	LD
	26%	A

Quality Indicator (Proposed)	Percentage of 130 of the Localities	Proposed Qualifier Indicated by School Division on the Remedial Plan
Secondary The regulation required the expected remediation goal for the student to include an expected target score on a locally-designed or selected test that measures the SOL content being remediated. Divisions reported the type of assessment used for this purpose as follows: S = SOL test, including retake of the SOL in 2006-2007 LS = Locally-selected (i.e., Algebra Readiness Diagnostic Test, PALS commercial test) LD = Locally-developed test (e.g., common tests developed by division staff) to measure student performance on SOL A = Alternate assessment as indicated on the IEP	79%	English/Writing S
	19%	LS
	32%	LD
	27%	A
	78%	Mathematics S
	32%	LS
	32%	LD
	26%	A
	71%	Social Studies S
	12%	LS
	32%	LD
	26%	A
	71%	Science S
	12%	LS
	29%	LD
	24%	A

Quality Indicator (Proposed)	Percentage of 130 of the Localities	Proposed Qualifier Indicated by School Division on the Remedial Plan
Eligibility for the remedial summer program is based on specific indicators.	87%	Indicator #1: The student failed all SOL tests in grades 3, 5, and 8.
	70%	Indicator #2: Failed a high school end-of-course test.
	0%	Indicator #3: Local criteria are established to determine eligibility.
Parental involvement indicators are provided.	97%	Indicator #1: Parents are provided with information regarding the criteria used to determine eligibility.
	80%	Indicator #2: Parents are provided with information regarding the content of the remediation program prior to beginning the program.

Quality Indicator (Proposed)	Percentage of 130 of the Localities	Proposed Qualifier Indicated by School Division on the Remedial Plan
Parental involvement indicators are provided. (Cont.)	52%	Indicator #3: Parents are provided with a copy of the individual student record, or information contained in the student record, prior to the beginning of the program.
	83%	Indicator #4: Parents are notified of progress made in the remediation program at specific intervals throughout the year.

C. Projected Budget Reported for 2005 Remedial Summer School

Total projected expenditures for the remedial summer program reported by school divisions in categories:	
Employee Salaries and Benefits	\$46,473,438
Transportation	7,154,254
Instructional Materials and Supplies	3,431,320
All Other Categories	1,975,828
Total Expenditures	\$59,034,840.000
Total projected revenues for the remedial summer program reported by school divisions:	
Non-state Revenue	\$34,607,231
State Revenue	24,427,609
Total Revenue	\$59,034,840.000